

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

**Please replace FIGS. 3A, 4A, 5, 7A and 7B with the attached Replacement Sheets.**

In FIG. 3A, reference character 35 is deleted.

In FIG. 4A, reference character 45 is deleted.

In FIG. 5, reference character 55 is deleted.

In FIG. 7A, reference characters 601, 603, 604, 704 and 705 are deleted, and indication of reference character 602 is changed.

In FIG. 7B, reference characters 704, 705, 801, 802 and 803 are deleted.

Attachment: 5 Replacement Sheets that include each of the above drawings,  
respectively

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 31, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

**I. Summary of Office Action**

The drawings are objected to as the Examiner alleges that replacement drawing sheets 2-6 do not include all of the figures appearing on the prior versions of the drawing sheets.

Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fukumoto et al. (USP 6,380,923; hereafter “Fukumoto”) in view of Mori (US Pub. 2003/0181817).

Claims 7-10 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fukumoto as modified by Mori, as applied to claims 1-5, 11-13 and 19-22 above, and further in view of Grimes (USP 4,414,537).

**II. Analysis of Drawing Objection**

The Examiner appears to allege that each of replacement drawings Figs. 3A, 4A, 5, 7A and 7B that are previously submitted does not show the other drawing in the same sheet of the original application.

In this Amendment, Applicant submits replacement sheets complying with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d), and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

**III. Analysis of § 103 Claim Rejection**

**Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 19-22**

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 11 by incorporating the features of claims 2 and 21. Claims 1 and 11 now define that the control unit of the finger-motion transmitting is a radio frequency identification (RFID) chip storing the ID of a (corresponding) finger, is adapted to store a finger-motion signal, and modulates the finger-motion signal.

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner alleges that Mori discloses an IC chip (11A of Fig. 4) and this IC chip can be considered an RFID chip. Applicant respectfully disagrees because of the following reason.

The vital sign detection sensor 10A of Mori is configured in the form of an IC chip, and this IC chip appears to include a vital sign transmitting unit 116A (Fig. 6) that is alleged to correspond to the claimed finger-motion transmitting unit. However, this IC chip does not correspond to the RFID chip as recited in the claim, at least because the IC chip does not store the ID of a finger to which the IC chip is attached to.

As generally known in the art, the RFID chip is mainly used for identifying a subject to which the RFID chip is attached to. For a similar purpose, the present application provides that an RFID chip is used to identify each corresponding finger to which the RFID chip is attached to. However, Mori does not need to use an RFID chip to identify a finger because this reference is only directed to detect a vital sign that does not require any differentiation between fingers.

Thus, Mori cannot be alleged to teach that the control unit of the finger-motion transmitting unit is an RFID storing an ID of a finger.

At least due to the above reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious over Fukumoto in view of Mori.

Claims 2-4 and 12-13 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements.

Claims 19-22 are canceled.

With respect to claim 5, Mori is alleged to teach a coil unit that is configured to be wound about a finger, and a control unit (11A of Fig. 4) that is configured to be positioned on top of the finger in the form of a chip. However, as clearly shown in the same drawing, the coil unit of Mori is not configured to be wound about a user's finger, but only the adhesive 131 is configured to be wound about a user's finger. Thus, Mori does not teach the subject matter of claim 5.

Claim 5 should also be allowable at least due to its dependency.

**Claims 7-10 and 15-18**

These claims should be allowable at least due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements at least because Grimes does not make up for the deficiencies of Fukumoto and Mori.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Seunghee Park  
Registration No. 60,719

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 30, 2008